

REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on January 14, 2008. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action, claims 1-14, were pending. By way of the present response applicant has: 1) amended claim 1; and 2) added no claims; and 3) canceled claims 2, 13, and 14. As such, claims 1 and 3-12 are now pending. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1 176 821 by Victor Fielding (hereinafter "Fielding") in view of Korean Application Publication No. 10-2001-0016381 by Hwan-Su Park (hereinafter, "Park").

It is respectfully submitted that Fielding does not teach or suggest a combination with Park and Park does not teach or suggest a combination with Fielding. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants' own disclosure, to combine Fielding with Park.

In reference to independent claim 1, applicant has incorporated the limitations of dependent claims 2, 13, and 14. Applicant respectfully submits that, even if Fielding and Park were combined, such a combination fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 1. As amended, claim 1 reads as follows:

A digital television converter for a television apparatus, said television apparatus which is incapable of reception of digital television broadcasts, said converter comprising:
a SCART connector for mating with a
corresponding connector on said television
apparatus so as to make electrical contact

therewith and be mechanically supported thereby;
a tuner for selecting and demodulating a digital television channel and for supplying to said connector signals in a form suitable for use by said television apparatus; and
a connector rear housing which cooperates with said connector to form a compact enclosure containing and mechanically supporting said tuner, wherein a height of said housing is approximately less than twice that of the SCART connector in order to provide a relatively compact converter; and
a power supply input connector mounted on said enclosure for connection to a remote power supply.

(Claim 1) (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Fielding and Park fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. For example, regarding claim 13 (now incorporated into claim 1), the Office Action stated that “[t]he combination Fielding-Park further discloses a power supply input connector mounted on said enclosure for connection to a remote power supply (see at least Park, FIG. 3, item 25).” (Office Action dated 1/14/08, p. 9).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action’s assertion. Item 25 is a “south bridge part” which manages “all kinds of the input-output functions with the function of controlling the I/O unit including the hard disk drive, the universal serial bus (USB), etc.” (Park, Structure & Operation of the Invention, paragraph 38). It is respectfully submitted that item 25 of Park is a circuit board component for handling input and output signals, not a power supply. The combination of Fielding and Park does not teach or suggest a remote power supply, much less a power supply input connector mounted on said enclosure for connection to a remote power supply.

Furthermore, regarding claim 14 (now incorporated into claim 1), the Office Action stated that “[t]he combination of Fielding-Park does not specifically disclose “wherein a height of said housing is approximately less than twice that of the SCART connector in order to provide a relatively compact converter.” (Office Action dated 1/14/08, p. 9). Applicant agrees with the Office Action that the combination of Fielding and Park lacks at least this limitation.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Fielding and Park.

Given that claims 3-9 and 11-12 are dependent claims with respect to amended claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and add additional limitations, applicant submits that claims 2-9 and 11-13 as amended are not obvious under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) in view of Fielding and Park.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3-9, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fielding in view of Park.

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Fielding and Park in further view of EP 1 045 584 A2 by Mark Smith (hereinafter, “Smith”). Given that claim 10 is a dependent claim with respect to amended claim 1 and adds additional limitations, applicant submits that claim 10 as amended is not obvious under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) in view of Fielding, Park, and Smith.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

Applicant reserves all rights under the doctrine of equivalence.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant hereby requests and authorizes the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: April 14, 2008

/Ryan W. Elliott/

Ryan W. Elliott
Reg. No. **60,156**

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300
Customer No.: 08791